

**Route 24 Improvements Project/
Route 54 Improvements Project
Field View
April 21, 2003
9:00 a.m.**

Meeting Minutes

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Gwen Davis	DE SHPO
Ann McCleave	DE SHPO
Maureen Mauger	DelDOT
Sonya LaGrand	DelDOT
Mike Hahn	DelDOT
Patrick Carpenter	DelDOT
Nathaniel Delesline	DelDOT
Nick Blendy	MTA
Rich Vetter	MTA
Jennifer Holl	MTA
Katie Post	MTA

The purpose of this meeting was to field view the architectural resources within the study area for Route 24 and Route 54 Improvements Projects and discuss the preliminary eligibility recommendations. (Note: Map numbers refer to the numbers assigned to the properties for *the Field Summary and Preliminary Eligibility Recommendations* packet dated March 2003 for each of the projects)

The field view commenced at the western terminus of the Route 54 project area.

1. Jennifer Holl and Katie Post asked Gwen Davis whether the new CRS forms require photos of each façade of every outbuilding, or if it is appropriate to enter “not visible” on the CRS form. Gwen asked that MTA email her the question and she would forward it to Robin Bodo.
2. A question was raised as to the limits of construction in this area and whether the APE went beyond the project limits. After discussion, it was decided that the properties west of Zion Church Road (Texaco intersection) were outside of the limits of work. This includes tax parcel 5-33-19-45 (Sound Methodist Church and its parsonage/Sunday school - Map Number 1) and 5-33-19-16 (Map Number 2). These resources will be given CRS numbers and any survey material completed thus far will be turned in to the SHPO; however, they will not be included in the Determination of Eligibility Report for the project, but noted in the methodology section.

3. Gwen Davis asked that MTA look at tax parcel 5-33-12-78 (Map Number 7) and 5-33-19-94 (S-2089 – Map Number 8) as possible agricultural complexes due to the extant outbuildings.
4. Gwen Davis and Ann McCleave suggested looking at the interior architecture of 5-33-12-88 (Map Number 9) to assess its eligibility within the bungalow context. They indicated that this resource might be unusual or just a modified bungalow type with one-over-one windows and non-exposed rafters.
5. Mike Hahn noted that he has a subdivision plan depicting several houses along the south side of Route 54 (5-33-12-95, 5-33-12.19-1 to 5-33-12.19-12 - Map Numbers 10-18). This subdivision plan shows that these houses do not meet the 50-year criteria. Mike said he would send this mapping to MTA.
6. Gwen Davis asked that MTA assign a new CRS number to tax parcel 5-33-12-92 (Map Number 19). The current CRS number S-2086 was assigned to a structure on the property that is no longer extant.
7. Gwen Davis suggested that MTA do further research on tax parcel number 5-33-19-24.01 (S-2091 – Map Number 24), as it may have been a school or other public building at one time.
8. Gwen Davis suggested reassessing the eligibility recommendation on tax parcel 5-33-19-27 (S-2097 – Map Number 26). She asked that MTA try to pinpoint the date of construction and an architect/builder if possible, in addition to any alterations.
9. Gwen Davis agreed that the properties at 5-33-19-25, 5-33-20-2, and 5-33-20-3 (Map Number 25) should probably be evaluated as a complex. However, she asked that MTA research the connection between the properties, i.e. same family, builder, etc.

The meeting broke for lunch and resumed at the southern terminus of the Route 24 Project area.

1. Jennifer Holl and Katie Post voiced their understanding that no work completed by DelDOT in Summer 2002 (lower portion of Route 24) would be duplicated by MTA. They asked Gwen Davis if this included site plans. Gwen asked MTA to email the question and she would forward it to Robin Bodo for a response. MTA will complete USGS mapping for each of the properties surveyed by DelDOT, in addition to the properties surveyed by MTA.
2. Gwen Davis noted that she wasn't sure that the current National Register Multiple Listing nomination for the Nanticoke Indian Community would be sufficient to assess the residential properties currently proposed as additions to the listing. She agreed that this was a difficult topic and that the SHPO would need to have some in-house discussions to decide how to handle these properties.
3. Gwen Davis suggested that the structures on tax parcels 2-34-17-39, 2-34-17-39.02 and 2-34-17-40 (S-9842 – Map Number 17) be evaluated separately, even though they are under the same ownership because they are not from the same period of significance (one structure does not meet the 50 year criteria). She also noted that eligibility under Criterion B for the Burton family connection would need to be significant because there are many Burtons associated with this area of Sussex County, and not all of them are prominent figures.

4. Gwen Davis agreed that the property at tax parcel 2-34-23-262 (S-9845 – Map Number 20), which may be part of the Nanticoke Indian Community Multiple Listing (pending SHPO discussions regarding the nomination), should also be evaluated under Criterion C for its architecture.
5. A question was raised as to the limits of construction in this area of the Route 24 Project and whether the APE went beyond the project limits. After discussion, it was decided that the resource on tax parcel 3-34-18-37.03 (Map Number 25) would be the first property in the APE. The resources at tax parcels 3-34-18-12, 3-34-18-32, 3-34-18-35, 3-34-18-36 (Map Numbers 21-24) and the bridge over Love Creek (S-8359) will be assigned CRS numbers and any survey work completed thus far will be submitted to the SHPO, however, these properties will not be evaluated in the Determination of Eligibility report for this project.
6. Mike Hahn asked if there is any connection between tax parcel 3-34-18-4 and 3-34-18-40.02 (S-1003 and S-1005 – Map Numbers 26 and 29) (i.e. tenant farming). Jennifer Holl responded that no connection had been found, but that MTA would do further research, if necessary.
7. Gwen Davis agreed that tax parcel 3-34-18-39 (S-1004 – Map Number 28) is outside the APE for this project.
8. All agreed that the structure at 3-34-12-46.01 (S-1006 – Map Number 39) is no longer extant.

Gwen Davis stated that the Route 26 context (with property types) should be completed prior to the submission of the Route 24 and Route 54 reports, as the anticipated property types and regional historic context are similar for all three projects. Currently, a meeting is scheduled to discuss the Route 26 Project on May 13, 2003 with DE SHPO, DelDOT and MTA. Where applicable, historic contexts and property types from the Route 26 Project will be used in evaluating the resources for the Route 24 and Route 54 areas. Consensus on the Route 26 context will help to expedite the completion of the Route 24 and Route 54 reports.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by:
McCORMICK, TAYLOR & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Katie Post
Research Assistant

cc: All Attendees
Robin Bodo, DE SHPO
Ted Foglietta, MTA
Francine Arnold, MTA

**Route 24 Improvements Project
Nanticoke Indian Community Meeting**

April 6, 2004

1:30 p.m.

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Chief James T. Norwood	Nanticoke Indian Community
Jean Norwood	Nanticoke Indian Community
Tran Norwood	Nanticoke Indian Community
Bill Davis	Nanticoke Indian Community
Shawn Wright	Nanticoke Indian Community
Gwen Davis	Delaware State Historic Preservation Office
Mike Hahn	Delaware Department of Transportation
Monroe Hite III	Delaware Department of Transportation
Maureen Mauger	Delaware Department of Transportation
Katie Diehl	McCormick Taylor
Jennifer Holl	McCormick Taylor

1. Monroe Hite III began the meeting with an introduction of the Route 24 Project. Mr. Hite explained that the design phase of the project is set to start, and that the cultural resource survey is currently underway. The purpose of this meeting today is to gather feedback and confirmation of potential historic nominations from the Nanticoke community representatives about this proposed project.
2. Maureen Mauger then gave a re-cap of the project, and spoke about its current status. Working group meetings were held in 2000 and 2001 to discuss the project with the community, and an Open House was held May 2003. Actual design for the Route 24 project will start in July 2004. The approximate project limits of the lower portion of the study area will run from the intersection of Banks Road to the Oak Orchard intersection. Route 24 will be one lane in each direction, with a turn lane, sidewalks and shoulders. Ms. Mauger said that the design phase of the project would take place for approximately 18 months.
3. Mike Hahn then took the floor and explained the Section 106 process. Mr. Hahn asked if everyone present was familiar with the Nanticoke Indian Community Thematic National Register Nomination completed in 1979, and the resources that were listed as a result. Mr. Hahn then referenced the *Field Summary and Preliminary Eligibility Recommendations* (March 2003) McCormick Taylor prepared, and said that we were gathered here today to talk about which properties

may fall within the context of the existing National Register (NR) Nomination, and which properties may merit their own NR Nomination.

4. Gwen Davis then talked about the northern portion of the APE from Love Creek to Plantations Road – she reminded everyone that this meeting for the Route 24 cultural resource survey covers both corridors.
5. Katie Diehl then directed everyone to the *Field Summary and Preliminary Eligibility Recommendations* (March 2003). She explained that every property with a structure 50 years in age or older was surveyed and a preliminary recommendation was made about their National Register eligibility. Ms. Diehl said that Nanticoke-owned properties were also considered to perhaps be a part of the Nanticoke Indian Community Thematic National Register Nomination. The review of the recommendations, as well as verification of all the Nanticoke-owned properties would begin with the lower portion of the Route 24 study area, from Oak Orchard Road to Banks Road.
6. Tran Norwood then asked about the process to amend a National Register Form, especially given the fact that the Route 24 corridor is facing development pressures.
7. Gwen Davis explained that for the purposes of the Route 24 project, a consensus might be formed as to what is eligible under the context. She added that the decision to formally amend the existing 1979 NR Thematic Listing was up to the Nanticoke community. Since all were in agreement that the existing NR Listing is dated, Ms. Davis then asked Mr. Norwood how the Nanticoke might define cultural or historic significance to the resources located within their community.
8. Mr. Norwood replied that he would let the group know when we were systematically going through the March 2003 Preliminary Cultural Resource Survey packet when there was a recommendation about eligibility for a property that he did not agree with.
9. Mike Hahn then replied that perhaps amending the existing NR Thematic Nomination with new representative property types, we would also include verifying the past resource information, and listing all of the changes that have occurred since 1979 (when the NR Form was originally done). The attendees all reviewed the map contained within the *Field Summary and Preliminary Eligibility Recommendations* (March 2003). Significance for each resource was discussed. Tran Norwood suggested four properties (S-9836, S-9839, S-9840 and S-9843) that were not considered for inclusion in the nomination should be reevaluated based on significance to the community. All Nanticoke properties were identified and properly labeled in terms of location and vicinity. Original names, approximate or known construction dates, and transfer of property (if known) were discussed.

10. Billy Davis said that a farmhouse was moved on his father's property for the convenience of place and economy of scale – since the old farmhouse was relatively inexpensive to build, the land was flat, manpower plentiful, and lumber around, it was easier often to move an old house than it was to build a new one.
11. Gwen Davis then broached the premise of Nanticoke ownership being the sole basis for inclusion in the National Register Listing. Does Nanticoke ownership alone mean that a property should be included in the National Register nomination? Tran Norwood replied that everyone knew where one of the Nanticoke community lived; the significance is about the house itself because people congregated there.
12. Discussion then turned to the naming or more properly distinguishing the communities. Riverdale and Lincoln Park are actually located along the water; however, they are not necessarily part of Oak Orchard as it is labeled on some maps. The area near the western limits of Route 24 (in question) is **not** known locally by the Nanticoke community as Warwick, as some maps have the place labeled. Billy Davis elaborated that community distinction or naming rights came with the ownership of land. Jean Norwood added that the area around Riverdale was the route that one traveled locally “by less means of travel” – such as by foot, wagon, or bicycle. Mr. Davis and Chief Norwood said that no one really moved their houses from the area known as Oak Orchard to the present-day Route 24 corridor. Sometimes (as stated earlier) there was little rhyme or reason why people opted to moved their houses. Some family members moved houses on their own property for economic and available building reasons and employers sometimes moved a structure to sell or give to an employee. Like many Sussex County examples, the relocation of buildings was a phenomenon with no specific trend or pattern. It was just a reasonable method for obtaining shelter or other outbuildings.
13. Around the Route 24 corridor Richard Calhoun moved many houses for 30+ years. He stopped moving homes in the late 1970s (so Calhoun was moving properties likely from the late 1940s – late 1970s). Richard lived east of Bay Farm. It is uncertain whether he was the one who helped move the houses related to the Route 24 Nanticoke-owned dwellings; however, it seems likely.
14. Tran Norwood stressed that moving houses still takes place today, and that there are still businesses around that cater to the house moving market.
15. Billy Davis stated that back during the mid-twentieth century and before (prior to the advent presumably of heavy machinery) that houses were moved on skids with horses. It was not at all unusual to witness houses being moved in the area near Route 24. Mr. Davis said that in order to move a house or structure that one would go into the wood, cut down a good number of trees, and align them so as to form a path. The building would then be jacked up by a wince in a circular motion

by oxen. Once this was accomplished, additional trees would be felled for a path, and the house would be moved to its new destination in this manner.

16. Discussion then turned to the northern section of Route 24. Tran Norwood stated that this portion was a much more “fluid” area than the southern portion of the proposed project area. Billy Davis added as an aside that Route 24 went through the area in 1938 with a new corridor, so in terms of the Nanticoke community, it is a relatively new roadway. Mr. Norwood stated his concern for the final appearance and function of the proposed roadway; specifically the stormwater management ponds.
17. Tran Norwood then indicated that there does not appear to be any resources along Route 24, between Love Creek and Route 1 that the Nanticoke community would identify as significant. However, there may be properties along Plantations Road that could be important; specifically the Israel Church area. In addition, changes to the Robinsonville Road area would impact the Nanticoke Community.
18. Billy Davis stated as an aside that the Doe Bridge to Millsboro (on Route 30) is thought of as a Nanticoke resource, as are some old gristmills located nearby. This is out of the proposed project area, but if the current NR Thematic Form is amended, this resource may be included.
19. Tran Norwood then asked if local development between Mountaire and the southern terminus of the current project is being slowed by this proposed project.
20. Maureen Mauger replied that “corridor preservation” is another component of this project. The Department’s Subdivision section will be working with developers to maintain the same typical section that the Route 24 Mainline Improvement design project will be implementing in areas outside of the limits of the above design project. This Route 24 Project is trying to work together with the highway overlay for Sussex County in each municipality.
21. Gwen Davis stated that the Hart’s Landing Subdivision on the northwest side of Route 24, north of Love Creek, is being reviewed under Preliminary Land Use Service (PLUS). Ms. Davis said she would keep the Nanticoke Community apprised of that discussion.
22. Mike Hahn and Monroe Hite then asked if there were any additional questions or comments about the meeting, and thanked everyone for attending. Mike stated that the draft Historic Resources Survey/Determination of Eligibility Survey would be sent to everyone in attendance at this meeting for review. It was also suggested that Ms. Davis, Mr. Norwood, and Mr. Hahn start thinking about and discussing possible mitigation measures for this project in the event of an adverse effect.

23. Chief Norwood invited the Department and the SHPO to participate in the May 1st Nanticoke Community Day to showcase the Route 24 project and the U.S. 113 North South project. The presentations will be held at the Nanticoke Community Center from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. Department representatives will be sent to participate.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:30 p.m.

Minutes taken by:

Jennifer Holl and Katie Diehl
McCormick Taylor

cc: Attendees
DESHPO
Daniel Griffith
Robin Bodo
DelDOT
Bob Taylor (Assistant Director, Engineering Support)
Terry Fulmer
Kevin Cunningham
Patrick Carpenter
McCormick Taylor
Theodore Foglietta
Francine Arnold
Kurt Miller
Richard Vetter
